REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 are the independent claims.

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-15 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action objected to claims 12-15 on formal grounds. By the Present Amendment, Applicant has amended these claims in view of the Examiner's comments. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Specifically, the recitation "extracting a minimum pixel level value" is allegedly unclear. In response, attention is respectfully directed to at least paragraphs [0022] and [0023] of the Specification whereat this feature is described. Applicant submits that this claim, in view of at least this description, satisfies the requirements of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,809,366 (Yamakawa et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,644,325 (King et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, selecting an R,G,B signal including video signal and displaying on a screen a message indicating whether the selected R,G,B is signal includes an abnormal video signal.

Independent claim 4 recites, inter alia, a signal inputting unit receiving R,G,B signals including video signals and a controller comparing a minimum pixel level value with a predetermined value and checking whether the selected R,G,B signal includes an abnormal video signal.

Independent claim 7 recites, inter alia, receiving R,G,B signals including video signals and determining if a selected R,G,B signal is abnormal based on a comparison between a minimum pixel level value in the selected R,G,B signal and a predetermined value.

Independent claim 11 recites, inter alia, a signal inputting unit receiving R,G,B video signals and an abnormal state detector detecting a video signal in an R,G,B signal selected

6

from among the received R,G,B signals based on a comparison of a detected pixel level value in the R,G,B signal and a predetermined value.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Yamakawa et al. nor King et al. teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11. Thus, while not conceding the propriety of the asserted combination of these citations, Applicant respectfully submits that the asserted combination is likewise deficient.

Yamakawa et al. relates to a method and a system for calibrating a color copier and teaches printing an image and calibrating the color balance of the copier using the image. At column 14, lines 27-25, Yamakawa et al. describes determining how much colors of a printed image deviate from an expected result and, when the deviation exceeds a threshold value, determining that image data was not properly read or input. However, Yamakawa et al. does not teach or suggest detecting whether an abnormal video signal is present in a selected R,G,B signal, as variously recited in independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11. This absence is not surprising since Yamakawa et al. seeks to improve color balance calibration in a color copier.

King et al. relates to a digital to analog converter with improved output level control and is cited for its teaching of providing R,G,B signals from a host. (Office Action, page 2). Applicant respectfully submits that King et al. adds nothing to the teachings of Yamakawa et al. to remedy the aforementioned deficiency in Yamakawa et al.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-27-05   By: _____
                                     Michael E. Kondoudis
                                     Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501